DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 357 474 EA 024 899

AUTHOR	Heger, Herbert K.; Lindahl, Ronald A.
TITLE	Some Implications of Site-Based Management on the Role and Preparation of Teachers and Administrators.
PUB DATE	Jan 93
NOTE	39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association (Austin, TX, January 1993).
AVAILABLE FROM	University of Texas at El Paso, College of Education, El Paso, TX 79968 (free, single copies).
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Role; *Decision Making; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Public Schools; *School Based Management; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	*Texas

ABSTRACT

Site-based management, decentralization of decision making to the school level, is a major component of restructuring the American educational system. However, despite the attention site-based management has received, many states and school districts have been slow to implement it. One reason for this failure could be the ability and willingness of teachers and administrators to take on the additional responsibility required by such reforms. Administrators and teachers in schools undergoing site-based management in El Paso County, Texas, were surveyed about their participation in decision making as well as their perceived need for additional education and training in this area. There was very strong agreement among respondents that teacher participation in certain tasks was essential to successful site-based management. The most significant finding was that teachers thought the tasks that were most important for them to participate in were those they had been most involved in under centralized governance systems--planning and instruction-related tasks. Those tasks traditionally the domain of administrators were considered of lesser importance. There was less agreement on which tasks teacher participation was likely. Similarly, responses varied on areas in which teachers and administrators thought additional training was needed. (Contains 20 references.) (JPT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED357474

Some Implications of Site-Based Management on the Role and Preparation of Teachers and Administrators

Dr. Herbert K. Heger
Professor
Educational Leadership and Foundations
College of Education
University of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, Texas 79968

Dr. Ronald A. Lindahl
Associate Professor
Doctoral Studies in Educational Leadership
School of Education
Gonzaga University
Spokane, Washington 99258

A Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the Southwest Educational Research Association

Austin, Texas

January, 1993

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

H. K. Heger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED 357 474 CS 214 899

Some Implications of Site-Based Management on the Roles and Preparation of Teachers and Administrators

This article reports the results of a study which examined the perceptions of teachers and administrators concerning both the importance and likelihood of their participation in a wide variety of tasks commonly associated with site-based management. It also reports on their perceptions regarding the need to develop specific skills which might be inherent in these tasks.

Introduction to Site-Based Management

A major component of the proposals for restructuring America's public education system has been a call for "site-based management," a practice which would decentralize much of the decision-making to the campus level and which would empower teachers to participate actively in those decisions (See Conley, Schmidle, and Shedd, 1988, pp. 259-260). One rationale for this movement is provided by Guthrie, who states: "A school faculty and its principal constitute -- or should constitute -- a natural team. Moreover, parents and students usually give their allegiance to a school, rather than to a district or to a statewide educational system. Thus it seems only logical that the school should be the primary decision-making unit in an educational system" (p. 306).

Despite the wide-spread attention given to site-based management, many states and school districts have been slow to implement this approach. As Hoyt (1991) notes, the odds are against successfully implementing any educational reform opposed by teachers or administrators. The 1986 survey by the National

Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) revealed that both teachers and administrators agreed with about three-quarters of the reform proposals of the Carnegie and Holmes groups; however, most of the significant differences were found precisely in the domain of teacher empowerment (p. 74). Part of the explanation for this may be found in the traditional loose-tight, or insular, cellular structure of schools. As Conley, Schmidle, and Shedd (1988) point out, "perhaps the only accurate generalization is that in most school systems, boards and administrators make decisions that affect more than one classroom, while teachers make decisions that affect (or seem to affect) only their own students and classrooms (p. 262). These same authors conclude that "school systems deny themselves, as systems, the opportunity to cultivate a continuously explanding body of professional and institutional knowledge that each individual can supplement, reinforce, and pass on to others" (p. 267).

On the other hand, techers and campus administrators have long expressed a desire for more meaningful participation in the decision making process. Alutto and Belasco (1972) found that the least satisfied individuals in their study were involved in fewer decisions than desired. Similarly, Holdaway (1978) found that participation in decision making was a factor well associated with overall job satisfaction. In addition to the idiographic benefit of potentially increased job satisfaction, nomothetic benefits are also projected from increased empowerment. Conley, Schmidle, and Shedd (1988) posit that the case for employee involvement in operational decision making derives from the need to take advantage of employees' intimate knowledge of work processes and of client/customer needs.

Part of the explanation for the slow adoption of site-based management may be found in the concept of group task maturity, as proposed by Hersey and Blanchard (1982), who describe maturity as "the ability and willingness of people

to take responsibility for directing their own behavior." Powell (1991) adds that the level of maturity of a particular group will, to some extent, determine the degree to which leadership can be shared effectively.

Cognitive Preparation of Teachers and Administrators to Participate in Site-Based Management

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) assert that a major factor in determining a group's maturity for addressing a specific task is the amount of education/training which the group has received relative to that task. The authors of this study recognize the potential significance of this factor in determining the implementation of site-based management and selected it as one of the foci for the study.

As Lieberman (1988) notes: "Scholars have written for years aobut teachers' need to participate more fully in their own learning." This may be especially important in the case of moving to site-based decision making, in which teachers (and administrators) may be called upon to make decisions in areas foreign to their previous education and training. Sarason (1986) noted the minimal education which teachers have even in regard to their primary classroom responsibilities. He states: "The preparation of teachers is blatantly inadequate in light of the realities of classrooms and schools. In comparison to other professions whose practitioners are clinicians (e.g., physicians, psychiatrists, or clinical psychologists) education requires the least and most narrow preemployment experience" (p. 6). However, teachers, through their pre-service preparation, experience, and in-service education do accrue significant knowledge in certain areas. For example, Powell (1991) asserts that "teachers are curriculum experts and can contribute greatly to curriculum decisions" (p. 13).

Recognizing that teachers and administrators possess greater cognitive expertise in certain areas than others, Conley and Bacharach (1990) underscore the need for teachers and administrators to "think strategically about implementing school-site management," perhaps by securing additional preparation in areas in which they are relatively less competent or informed (p. 544). They suggest that an important question which should be considered in shaping teachers' participation in decision making is: "What is the basis of their expertise and professional identity?" (p. 543). If teachers and campus administrators are to participate in a broader range of decisions, it would seem logical that some would need additional preparation in areas of lesser familiarity.

This is supported by the conclusions of Harrison, Killion, and Mitchell (1989), reporting on their own district's attempt at implementing site-based management. These authors state: "We realized we needed to establish the underlying conditions necessary for true collaboration in each school," (p. 33). Another mistake was our failure to provide training in site-based management for school personnel (p. 57). This training should involve not only content issues, but group process training as well.

With these concerns in mind, the researchers of the present study solicited responses not only relative to teachers' and administrators' participation in various decision areas, but also responses related to their perceived need for additional education/training on issues directly related to these areas. Some resistance to the need to seek additional education/training in areas of least comfort and familiarity could be anticipated. As Little (1986) notes: "A teacher left to rely on individual preference and skill may reasonably choose to avoid a new practice rather than take the chance that a substantial investment of time and thought will not pan out" (p. 29).

Which Decision Areas Might be Addressed at the Campus Level?

Conley, Schmidle, and Shedd (1988) note that the teacher participation research literature has not kept pace with the movement toward site-based management, since it usually confines discussion of teacher participation to the making of formal policy and involvement in a limited number of substantive areas, such as instructional policy decisions (p. 260). Similarly, the literature in educational administration has not adequately researched the potential new role of the campus administrator under site-based management.

Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman (1978) note that such participation may vary not only throughout the process, but issue by issue. This is later supported by Schneider (1984), who cites Lipham 's work (1974) as instrumental in the conclusion that the involvement of individuals other than the decision maker should vary at different stages in the decision making process (p. 25).

Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman (1978) differentiate between "technical" decisions, e.g., about textbooks and instruction, and "managerial" decisions, e.g., about hiring and job assignments, conceding, however, that often such distinctions are blurred. They found that, traditionally, teachers were more likely to be involved in technical than managerial decisions. Conley and Bacharach (1990) reached similar conclusions, find that teachers clearly want the greatest influence over operational classroom decisions, e.g., how to teach, textbooks, and are least desirous of having influence on strategic organizational decisions, e.g., hiring and budget decisions. They added, however, that teachers feel most deprived of participation in decisions which address the strategic/operational interface, the interaction between the school and the classroom. Examples of such decisions include how children are assigned to classes, how teachers are scheduled, and how students are disciplined and promoted (pp. 542-543). Another

schema for examining decision areas is found in Conley, Schmidle, and Shedd (1988), who propose four broad areas: direction, or the specification of responsibilities in terms of purpose and/or activity, organization, or the structuring of relationships between and among individuals and groups, support, or the provision of resources, and monitoring, being the ongoing collection and evaluation of information related to performance (p. 267).

Duke, Showers, and Imber (1980) concluded that teachers were less than anxious to participate in schoolwide or managerial decision-making and derived little satisfaction when they did. In explaining this phenomenon, Schneider (1984) cites Bridges' and Barnard's models of shared decision making, which are based on the participants' "zones of indifference." This model postulates that administrators must assess both the participants' perceptions of relevance and degree of expertise relative to each decision topic in order to determine whether the topic falls within their zone of indifference. Clear and Seager (1971) studied the same concept, and caution that teachers prefer to participate in more decisions than administrators tend to accept as ground for shared decision making. In their summarization of research in the area, Hoy and Miskel (1991) conclude that if subordinates possess a personal stake in the decision and knowledge to make a useful contribution, then they should be involved in the decision-making process.

More specifically, Schneider (1984) found that teachers prefer to be involved in issues of high interest and expertise, e.g., specifying learning objectives, reporting student progress to parents, selecting textbooks and instructional materials, determining evaluation procedures, setting and revising school goals, determining procedures to be used in evaluating teachers, evaluating their own administrators, determining organizational structure, hiring new faculty members, establishing disciplinary policies, and preparing

departmental/instructional team budgets (p. 29). The NASSP study strongly favored teacher involvement in decisions with respect to materials and instructional methods to be used, organization of the school day, assignment of students, and allocation of resources available to the school (Hoyt, 1991). Conley, Schmidle, and Shedd (1988) recommend that teacher participation can benefit decisions in areas such as translating general policies into group and individual assignments, coordinating different activities, setting and adjusting time schedules, reconciling conflict priorities, developing human resources, securing material and other resources, and monitoring the progress of programs, staff members, and students (p. 267). They also cite recent research on school effectiveness as grounds for teacher participation in goal consensus and establishing school mission (p. 265). Finally, Guthrie (1986) recommends that teachers participate significantly in developing a statistical description of the school, including data on pupil performance, as well as reporting to stakeholders on future plans and budgets (p. 308).

Although the literature provides grounds to postulate that teachers may have greater experience, expertise, and comfort in making decisions in areas that Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman (1978) classified as "technical" rather than "managerial," it also supports the importance of extensive teacher involvement in a wide scope of decision areas. This broad range of areas, then, forms the basis of the survey instrument employed in the present study.

Setting of the Study

In 1991-92, Texas began a statewide-effort to implement site-based management. One of the mandates from the Texas Education Agency was the creation of a site-based management committee on each campus, to be led by the principal, but to be composed primarily of teachers and to include parent and

community representation. The present study was conducted in various school districts of El Paso County, Texas, a primarily urban/suburban area in far West Texas, bordering on both New Mexico and Mexico. The schools surveyed were from districts with multiple campuses at each level (elementary, middle/junior high, and high school) and were presumed to be essentially beginning the shift from traditionally centralized districts to the projected goal of site-based management. This selection of districts was made in hopes of gathering some baseline data which could then be compared with similar data gathered at later phases of implementation or disengagement from site-based management.

The Research Problem

The problem addressed in this study was to determine teacher and administrator perceptions on the prospective participation of teachers and administrators in managerial tasks commonly assigned to the campus level under systems of site-based management. Additionally, it sought to determine their perceptions regarding the types of additional training/preparation which would then be necessary for teachers and/or administrators to assume successfully, these new roles.

The Instrument

The instrument was developed after an examination of site-based management literature and current Texas Education Agency regulations and guidelines. A pilot study to verify aspects of validity and reliability was conducted with a non-randomized sample of 92 teachers and administrators from public schools in El Paso County, Texas. These respondents were enrolled in graduate studies in education at The University of Texas at El Paso. Based on the results of

this preliminary study, the instrument was refined into the version used in the current study.

The Sample

A stratified random sample of 462 participants was identified. Response rate was near 100% since data were collected through visits to respondents, the number of valid responses for each item of the survey ranged from approximately 350 to the full 462. Some of the variation was due to respondent omissions of items while other omissions were caused by the inapplicability of the item to a respondent. Careful examination of the data and especially of the missing data did not reveal any systematic pattern which would appear to skew the results analyzed.

The sample was comprised of 18.3% administrators, 28.7% teachers currently serving on the site-based management teams, and 53% teachers not serving on the teams. Of these, 54.1% were on elementary campuses, 19.7% at the middle school level, and 26.2% at the high school level. Respondents were distributed among the El Paso area school districts in approximate relation to district size.

The respondents were varied as to educational level, with 55.1% holding only bachelor's degrees, 42.7% with master's degrees, and 1.9% with doctorates. The sample also varied considerably in professional experience in education, from first-year teachers to a maximum of 36 years of experience. The mean years of experience was 12.8 years, with both the median and the mode being 12 years, and a standard deviation of 7.8 years.

As anticipated, almost all administrators possessed a master's degree or doctorate and greater experience than their teacher counterparts. Teachers on the site-based management teams also possessed higher levels of education and

years of experience than their peers not serving on these teams. Elementary teachers and high school teachers possessed slightly higher levels of education and experience than their middle school counterparts (See Tables 1-4). As Hoyt (1991) noted regarding the earlier NASSP study, the sample was comrised largely of career professional education, "probably far better than average both in knowledge and in professional commitment" (p. 69). The sample selected for the current study was randomized to prevent such a bias.

Table 1

Highest Degree Held, by Respondent's Position

Degree		Administrator	Teacher on Site Committee	Teacher Not On Site Committee
Bachelor's	n=	3	53	132
		5%	56%	73%
Master's	n=	55	40	46
		92%	42%	25%
Doctorate	n=	2	2	3
		3%	2%	2%

Table 2

Highest Degree Held, by Respondent's School Level

Degree	Elementary	Middle	High
Bachelor's	n= 92	41	54
	%= 52	66	57
Master's	n= 83	19	39
	%= 47	31	41
Doctorate	n= 2	2	2
	%= 1	3	2

Table 3

Years of Professional Experience by Position

Position	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Administrator	63	18.1	7.7
Teacher on Site-Team	96	13.3	7.6
Teacher Not on Site-Team	195	11.0	7.3

Patterns of experience by school level showed less variability.

Table 4

Years of Professional Experience by School Level

School Level	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Elementary	177	12.9	7.8
Middle	62	11.1	7.5
High	95	12.9	7.3

All data patterns in the sample were considered to be representative of the overall education community of El Paso County.

Summary of the Overall Findings

There appeared to be very strong agreement among respondents that teacher participation in certain tasks were essential to the success of site-based management. These tasks could be categorized primarily as being those most closely linked to planning and instruction. Included in this set of highly congruent responses were the need to develop a campus mission statement, develop long-range campus objectives, assess the campus' accomplishment of these objectives, select instructional materials, determine inservice needs, evaluate student performance, provide for the early identification of potential at-risk students, evaluate the effectiveness of instructional programs, determine the optimum curriculum, determine appropriate instructional strategies for specific student populations and subject areas, determine optimal time allocations for each subject, and establish school policies related to instructionally-related issues such as discipline, retention, etc. (See Table 5).

Another set of tasks was viewed as generally important for teachers to participate in received a lesser, yet substantial, degree of agreement. These included reporting on the attainment of the school's objectives to parents and the community, determining optimum staffing patterns, selecting teachers and staff, establishing the school budget, and evaluating the differential performance of various sub-groups within the school population (See Table 6).

Table 5

Tasks for Which a High Degree of Agreement Was Reported

Task		Teacher Participation Important	Teacher Participation Not Important
Develop Campus Mission	n=	338	42
	%=	88.9	11.1
Develop Long-Range Objectives	n=	350	28
	%=	92.6	7.4
Assess Accomplishment of Objectives			
	n=	334	36
	%=	90.3	9.7
Determine Inservice Needs	n=	337	34
	%=	90.8	9.2
Evaluate Student Performance	n=	367	10
	%=	97.3	2.7
Select Instructional Materials	n=	360	12
	%=	96.8	3.2
Identify At-Risk Students	n=	361	13
	%=	96.5	3.5
Evaluate Program Effectiveness			
	n=	352	23
	%=	93.9	6.1
Determine Curriculum	n=	335	32
	%=	91.3	8.7
Determine Instructional Strategies			
	n=	343	25
	%=	93.2	6.8

(Table 5, continued)

Task	Teacher Participation Important	Teacher Participation Not Important
Set School Policy	n= 324	40
	%= 89.0	11
Determine Time Allocation	n= 320	47
	%= 87.2	12.8

Table 6

Tasks for Which a Moderate Degree of Agreement Was Reported

Task		Teacher Participation Important	Teacher Participation Not Important
Report on Objectives	n=	299	68
	%=	81.5	18.5
Determine Staffing	n=	248	108
	%=	69.7	30.2
Set Budget	n=	292	71
	%=	80.4	19.6
Select Teachers & Staff	n=	240	116
		67.4	32.6
Evaluate Performance of	n=	265	97
Sub-Groups	%=	73.2	26.8

Similar moderate levels of consensus were reported regarding the likelihood of significant teacher participation in various types of decisions. It must be noted that strong consensus of such likelihood was not reported for any specific task. Those for which moderate agreement on likelihood of teacher participation included development of the campus mission statement, development of campus objectives, evaluation of campus progress toward attaining its objectives, reporting to parents and community on the attainment of objectives, selection of instructional materials, determining inservice needs, evaluating student progress, identifying potential at-risk students, establishing an optimum curriculum for the campus, selecting instructional strategies for specific student populations and subject areas, and establishing instructionally-related school policies (See Table 7). When compared to the higher level of consensus regarding the importance of these items, these results seem to indicate a perception that even with the projected move toward site-based management, administrators will continue to take a dominant role in many of these decisions.

Table 7

Tasks for Which a Moderate Degree of Agreement Was Reported

Task		Teacher Participation Likely	Teacher Participation Not Likely
Develop Campus Mission	n=	288	70
	%=	80.4	19.6
Develop Long-Range Objectives	n=	293	66
	%=	81.6	18.4
Assess Accomplishment of Objectives			
	n=	235	113
	%=	67.5	22.5
Determine Inservice Needs	n=	229	125
	%=	64.7	25.3
Evaluate Student Performance	n=	308	47
	%=	86.8	13.2
Select Instructional Materials	n=	275	82
	%=	77.0	23.0
Identify At-Risk Students	n=	288	69
	%=	80.7	19.3
Evaluate Program Effectiveness	n=	227	130
	%=	63.6	26.4
Determine Curriculum	n=	207	140
	%=	59.7	40.3
Determine Instructional Strategies			
	n=	234	114
	%=	67.4	22.6

(Table 7, continued)

Task	Teacher Participation Likely	Teacher Participation Not Likely
Set School Policy	n= 201	148
	%= 57.6	42.4

Moderate agreement was also reported regarding the use of knowledge/skills in certain areas. These included general computer literacy, the interpretation of standardized scores, the use and interpretation of school climate instruments, the analysis of standardized tests in specific academic areas, descriptive statistics, aptitude tests, and local productivity date (See Table 8). Respondents indicated that these skills are needed either frequently or occasionally in the site-based administration of schools.

Table 8

Skills for Which a Moderate Degree of Agreement was Reported

Task		Frequently	Occasionally	Infrequently/Never
General Computer Literacy				
	n=	165	145	66
	%=	43.9	38.6	17.6
School Climate Instruments	n=	170	143	57
	%=	45.9	38.6	15.4
Standardized Tests in Academic Areas				
	n=	190	141	143
	%=	50.1	37.7	11.5

(Table 8, continued)

Task		Frequently	Occasionally	Infrequently/Never
Descriptive Statistics	n=	161	164	48
	%=	43.2	44.0	12.9
Aptitude Tests	n=	122	179	74
	%=	32.5	47.7	19.7
Local Productivity Data	n=	161	159	56
	%=	42.8	42.3	14.9

Far less agreement was reported regarding the probability of teacher participation in evaluating the differential performance of specific sub-groups of the student population, determining the optimum allocation of time within the school day for specific subjects, using and interpreting aptitude tests, developing and interpreting surveys, and interpreting district and campus-level productivity data (See Table 9).

Table 9

Tasks for Which Little Agreement Was Reported

Task		Teacher Participation Likely	Teacher Participation Unlikely
Evaluate Sub-Group Performance			
	n=	187	162
	%=	53.6	46.4
Determine Time Allocation	n=	185	166
	%=	52.7	47.3

Again, a pattern was noted of less agreement regarding the probability of teacher participation in each task than the perceived overall importance of teacher participation in each task to campus success under site-based management.

Negative reactions were recorded for the probability of teacher participation in such traditionally administrator-prerogative tasks as establishment of staffing patterns, selection of teachers and staff, and setting of the campus budget (See Table 10).

Similarly respondents found little need for additional knowledge and skills in the areas of data base development, standardized scores, inferential or multivariate statistics, interpretation of state and national productivity data, or post-graduation longitudinal studies of student success (See Table 11).

Table 10

Tasks for Which Negative Responses Were Reported

Task		Teacher Participation Likely	Teacher Participation Unlikely
Determine Staffing Patterns	n=	112	239
	%=	31.9	68.1
Select Teachers and Staff	n=	123	238
	%=	34.1	65.9
Set Budget	n=	159	198
	%=	44.5	55.5

Table 11

Skills for Which Negative Responses Were Reported

Skill		Frequently	Occasionally	Infrequently/Never
Data Bases	n=	62	192	116
	%=	16.8	51.9	31.4
Inferential Statistics	n=	64	154	149
	%=	17.4	42.0	40.6
Multivariate Statistics	n=	29	96	240
	%=	7.9	26.3	65.8
State/National Data	n=	76	197	100
	%=	20.4	52.8	26.8
Longitudinal Studies	n=	42	187	108
	%=	11.3	38.3	50.7
Standardized Scores	n=	76	187	108
	%=	20.5	50.4	29.1

For all those tasks for high or moderate levels of agreement were reported regarding importance to the success of campuses under site-based management, respondents indicated that those tasks should, indeed, be implemented. However, responses were fairly equitably varied as to the time frame in which this implementation should occur. In some schools, implementation of some of these tasks was already underway or planned for immediate implementation. In other cases, respondents saw implementation as an issue for the next one to three years. An equal percentage of respondents saw implementation as important, but most likely not to occur within the next three years (See Table 12).

Table 12

Respondents' Projected Implementation Schedule, by Task Area

		Currently Done	Begin Immediately	Begin Within 3 Yrs	Not Within 3 Yrs
Task Area					
Planning Tasks	n=	253	47	43	7
	%=	66	12	11	2
Instructional Leadership Tasks	n=	177	79	65	10
	%=	46	20	17	3
Campus-Wide Student Performance Tasks	n=	190	89	53	7
	%=	49	23	14	2
Curricular Tasks	n=	145	88	80	8
	%=	38	23	21	2

In analyzing the perceived need for additional training/preparation, little discernable pattern could be found. Respondents generally felt either that both administrators and teachers need additional training in order to ensure campus success on the various tasks, or that neither group requires additional preparation. Those tasks for which the greatest need for training was perceived were for typical instructionally-related tasks such as the determination of appropriate instructional strategies for each subject area, determination of the optimum curriculum, evaluation of program effectiveness, and identification of at-risk students. The need for additional preparation for this group of tasks was

closely followed by a group of tasks traditionally considered administrative, i.e., determining optimum staffing patterns, and setting the campus budget. The tasks for which the least need for additional training/preparation was considered necessary were planning tasks, i.e., developing the campus mission, assessing the campus' progress toward fulfilling its objectives, and reporting that progress to parents and the community (See Table 13).

Table 13

Perceived Need for Additional Training/Preparation

Task		Teachers Need	Administrators Need	Both Need	No Need
Develop Campus Mission					
	n=	54	7	143	137
	%=	14.0	1.8	37.0	35.5
Develop Long-Range Objectives					
	n=	5	11	172	96
	%=	13.7	2.8	44.6	24.9
Assess Accomplishment	n=	38	19	153	115
	%=	9.8	4.9	39.6	29.8
Determine Inservice Needs	n=	32	32	147	105
	%=	8.3	8.3	38.1	27.2
Evaluate Student Performance					
	n=	60	10	149	112
	%=	15.5	2.6	38.6	29.0

(Table 13 Cont'd)		Teachers	Administrators	Both	No
Task		Need	Need	Need	Need
Select Instructional Materials					
	n=	49	25	141	104
	%=	12.7	6.5	36.5	26.9
Identify At-Risk Students	n=	54	9	197	69
	%=	14.0	2.3	51.0	17.9
Evaluate Program Effectiveness					
	n=	37	22	200	66
	%=	9.6	5.7	51.8	17.1
Determine Curriculum	n=	33	23	191	63
	%=	8.5	6.0	49.5	16.3
Determine Instructional Strategies	n=	50	11	199	47
	%=	13.0	2.8	51.6	12.2
Set School Policy	n=	26	24	174	88
	%=	6.7	6.2	45.1	22.8
Determine Time Allocations	n=	42	27	155	91
	%=	10.9	7.0	40.2	23.6
Report on Accomplishments	n=	40	24	136	120
	%=	10.4	6.2	35.2	31.1
Determine Staffing	n=	59	70	119	70
	%=	15.3	18.1	30.8	18.1
Set Budget	n=	64	42	140	76
	%=	16.6	10.9	36.3	19.7

Table 13 Cont'd)		Teachers	Administrators	Both	No
Task		Need	Need	Need	Need
Select Teachers and Staff					
	n=	61	66	109	81
	%=	15.8	17.1	28.2	21.0
Evaluate Performance of					
Sub-Groups	n=	46	29	146	99
	%=	11.9	7.5	37.8	25.6

In regard to the question as to by whom these "important" tasks should be implemented, administrators were almost universally considered essential to implementation. However, respondents were basically evenly divided between those indicating that all professionals on the campus should participate in these tasks and those who felt that implementation responsibility should rest with those teachers selected to the site-based management team.

Differentiated Responses within Sub-Groups of the Sample

In analyzing the results according to the school level of the respondents, very little variation could be attributed to this variable. Overall, those respondents working at the high school level were slightly more skeptical regarding the likelihood of teacher participation in the various tasks associated with site-based management. The lone exception to this was that those respondents from the elementary school level projected a lower probability of teachers being involved in setting the school budget.

Analysis of the results by education level was complicated by the low number of respondents with doctoral degrees. Cell sizes of this group were

considered too small to yield valid results. Overall, there was little variation between the responses recorded by respondents with master's degrees and those with bachelor's degrees. Respondents holding master's degrees indicated slightly higher levels of perceived importance of teachers participating in the various tasks of site-based management, except in the areas of selecting instructional materials, determining inservice needs, evaluating student progress, and identifying potential at-risk students. For these specific tasks, those respondents holding bachelor's degrees reported slightly higher levels of perceived importance for teacher participation. The other significant difference in the responses of the two degree classifications was that those holding master's degrees responded that administrators did not need additional training for setting the school budget, whereas those holding bachelor's degrees considered that such additional training for administrators was necessary. One interpretation of this differential response may be linked to the fact that the master's degree group included all the responding administrators, with the exception of those two who hold doctoral degrees.

The greatest differentiation of responses was encountered when the data were analyzed according to the position of the respondent. As is evidenced in Table 14, administrators almost universally perceived teacher participation in tasks to be more important than did teachers on the site-based management committee. Similarly, those teachers on the committee perceived a greater degree of importance for teacher participation in most tasks than did their peers not on the committee.

Table 14

Perceived Importance of Teacher Participation in Tasks, by Position

Tasks Committee		Administrator	Teacher On-Site Committee	Teacher Not On-Site
Develop Campus Mission	n=	57	97	166
	%=	95	89	84
Develop Long-Range Objectives				
	n=	59	101	171
	%=	98	93	86
Assess Accomplishment	n=	55	98	161
	%=	92	90	82
Determine Inservice Needs				
	n=	54	101	165
	%=	90	93	83
Evaluate Student Performance				
	n=	58	106	187
	%=	97	97	94

(Table 14 Cont'd)

Tasks		Administrator	Teacher On-Site Committee	Teacher Not On-Site Committee
Select Instructional Materials				
	n=	57	103	184
	%=	95	94	93
Identify At-Risk Students	n=	56	102	186
	%=	93	94	94
Evaluate Program Effectiveness				
	n=	57	99	179
	%=	95	91	90
Determine Curriculum	n=	51	96	172
	%=	85	88	87
Determine Instructional Strategies				
	n=	55	95	176
	%=	92	87	89
Set School Policy	n=	53	90	167
	%=	88	83	87
Determine Time Allocations				
	n=	51	89	164
	%=	85	82	83
Report on Accomplishments				
	n=	52	85	143
	%=	87	78	72
Determine Staffing	n=	45	77	116
	%=	75	71	59

(Table 14 Cont'd) Tasks		Administrator	Teacher On-Site Committe	Teacher Not On-Site Committee
Set Budget	n=	50	85	143
	%=	83	78	72
Select Teachers and Staff	n=	43	74	116
	%=	72	68	59
Evaluate Performance of Sub-Groups	n=	49	78	125
	%=	82	72	63

A similar pattern was found regarding the likelihood of teacher participation in each task. As depicted in Table 15, teachers not on the committee were more pessimistic about such participation than their peers on the committee. Administrators displayed the greatest optimism regarding teacher participation in these tasks.

Table 15

Perceived Likelihood of Teacher Participation in Tasks, by Position

Tasks		Administrator	Teacher On-Site Committee	Teacher Not On-Site Committee
Develop Campus Mission	n=	60	109	198
	%=	16	28	51
Develop Long-Range Objectives				
	n=	53	87	137
	%=	14	23	35
Assess Accomplishment	n=	46	71	105
	%=	12	18	25
Determine Inservice Needs	n=	47	71	98
	%=	12	18	25
Evaluate Student Performance	n=	55	87	151
	%=	14	23	39
Select Instructional Materials	n=	51	81	131
	%=	13	21	34
Identify At-Risk Students	n=	48	77	146
	%=	12	20	38
Evaluate Program Effectiveness				
	n=	43	62	108
	%=	11	16	28
Determine Curriculum	n=	35	59	100
	%=	9	15	26

(Table 15 Cont'd) Task		Administrator	Teacher On Site Committee	Teacher Not On-Site Committee
Determine Instructional Strategies	n=	42	70	111
	%=	11	70	29
Set School Policy	n=	42	53	96
	%=	11	14	25
Determine Time Allocations	n=	38	50	85
	%=	10	13	22
Report on Accomplishments	n=	44	63	85
	%=	11	16	85
Determine Staffing	n=	32	32	43
	%=	8	8	11
Set Budget	n=	40	48	64
	%=	10	12	17
Select Teachers and Staff	n=	32	39	48
	%=	8	10	12
Evaluate Performance of Sub-Groups	n=	41	51	85
	%=	11	13	22
Global Average	**n=**	**60**	**109**	**98**
	%=	**16**	**28**	**51**

The least variance was noted in regard to the utility of specific skills to the success of the campus under site-based management. As Table 16 illustrates, there is fairly close overall agreement regarding these skills.

Table 16

Perceived Need for Skills, by Position*

Skill Area		Administrator	Teacher On-Site Committee	Teacher Not On-Site Committee
General Computer Literacy	n=	56	83	156
	%=	15	21	40
Data Bases	n=	48	62	133
	%=	12	16	35
Descriptive Statistics	n=	51	95	163
	%=	13	24	42
Standard Scores	n=	42	71	137
	%=	11	19	35
Inferential Statistics	n=	28	65	114
	%=	7	17	30
Multivariate Statistics	n=	16	42	58
	%=	5	11	15
Aptitude Tests	n=	46	87	154
	%=	12	22	40

* Number indicates % of responses listing the skill/knowledge as being of frequent or occasional utility.

(Table 16 Cont'd)

Skill Area		Administrator	Teacher On-Site Committee	Teacher Not On-Site Committee
Surveys	n=	48	83	139
	%=	12	21	36
Climate Instruments	n=	49	94	155
	%=	13	24	40
Local Productivity Data	n=	55	89	160
	%=	14	23	42
State/National Productivity Data	n=	49	73	140
	%=	13	19	36
Longitudinal Studies	n=	31	54	90
	%=	8	14	23
Achievement Tests in Academic Areas				
	n=	51	92	174
	%=	13	24	45
Global Average	**n=**	**60**	**109**	**198**
	%=	**16**	**28**	**51**

Conclusions

Perhaps the most significant conclusion that can be reached regarding the results obtained in this survey research study is that they generally confirmed the positions presented in the review of literature. The tasks which were perceived to be most important for teachers to participate in are those in which teachers have most heavily participated under systems of centralized governance.

These are essentially planning and - instructionally-related tasks. Those tasks typically considered the of administrators under traditional governance patterns were considered of lesser importance, and of far lesser probability, for teacher participation.

Regardless of their appreciation of the importance of teacher participation in specific tasks, respondents did not always accept the need for some of the apparent component skills and knowledge for those tasks. Respondents generally acknowledged the need for skills in areas of greater familiarity, e.g., descriptive statistics and general computer literacy, and denied the need for the development of skills in less familiar areas, e.g., inferential or multivariate statistics and longitudinal studies.

The need for additional preparation also varied somewhat according to the respondents' familiarity with the task area. For example, the greatest training needs were identified as being in the areas of assumed greatest familiarity to the respondents, e.g., selecting instructional strategies or determining curriculum, whereas the least need for training was in assumedly less familiar task areas, e.g., assessing campus accomplishment of goals and reporting this progress to parents and to the community. Similarly, although all task areas surveyed were generally considered to be of high to moderate importance for teachers to participate in, the implementation schedule varied from already implemented to unlikely to be implemented during the next three years.

The data would appear to reflect an incipient stage of change to site-based management, a phase in which there is greater identification with past responsibilities than overt acceptance of and affinity for emerging possibilities. Some degree of skepticism would appear to be present regarding the likelihood of these new possibilities becoming reality. Some degree of resistance would appear

to be present in embracing the need for developing skills and knowledge in new, possibly intimidating areas of study.

As such, the study serves as the documentation of current status. Perhaps it may also serve to provide some baseline data for future comparisons/contrasts, which will yield some evidence to perceptual changes which may accompany the ongoing implementation of site-based management.

References

Alutto, J.A, & Belasco, J.A. (1972). A typology for participation in organizational decision making. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 117-125.

Benson, N., & Malone, P. (1987). Teachers' beliefs about shared decision making and work alienation. Education, 107, (3), 244-251.

Bridges, E.M. (1967). A model of shared decision making in the school principalship. Educational Administration Quarterly, 3 (1), 49-61.

Clear, D.K., & Seager, R.C. (1971). Legitimacy of administrative influence as perceived by selected groups. Educational Administration Quarterly, 7, 46-63.

Conley, S.C., & Bacharach, S.B. (1990). From school-site management to participatory school-site management. Phi Delta Kappan, 71, (7), 539-544.

Conley, S. C., Schmidle, T., & Shedd, J.B. (1988). Teacher participation in the management of school systems. Teachers College Record, 90 (2), 259-280.

Duke, D.L., Showers, B K., & Imber, M. (1980). Teachers and shared decision making: The costs and benefits of involvement. Educational Administration Quarterly, 16 (1) , 93-106.

Guthrie, J. W. (1986). School-based management: The next needed education reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, (4), 305-309.

Harrison, C.R., Killion, J.P., & Mitchell, J.E. (1989). Site-based management: The realities of implementation. Educational Leadership,46, (8), 55-58.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1982). Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Holdaway, E.A. (1978). Facet and overall job satisfaction. Educational Administration Quarterly, 14 (1), 30-47.

Hoy, W.K., & Miskel, C.G. (1991). Educational administration: theory, research, and practice (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hoyt, K.B. (1991). Administrators and teachers express their support, opposition to reform proposals. NASSP Bulletin, 75, (534), 67-74.

Lieberman, A. (1988). Teachers and principals: Turf, tension, and new tasks. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, (9), 648-653.

Little, J. W. (1986). Seductive images and organizational realities in professional development. In Lieberman, A. (ed.) . Rethinking school improvement: Research, craft, and concept. Columbia University, New York: Teachers College Press.

Mohrman, A.M., Jr., Cooke, R.A., & Mohrman, S.A. (1978). Participation in decision making: A multidimensional perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 14 (1), 13-19.

Osterman, K.F. (1989). Supervision and shared authority: A study of principal and teacher control in six urban middle schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California.

Powell, N.J. (1991). School-based management in smaller secondary schools. NASSP Bulletin, 75, (533), 11-16.

Sarason, S. (1986). The preparation of teachers revisited. In Lieberman, A. (ed.). Rethinking school improvement: Research, craft, and concept. Columbia University, New York: Teachers College Press.

Schneider, G.T. (1984). Teacher involvement in decision making: Zones of acceptance, decision conditions, and job satisfaction. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18 (1), 25-32.